Unknown

From: Governor Sarah Palin (GOV sponsored) [governor@alaska.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 1:46 PM
To: Smith; Lynne M (GOV)
Subject: FW: uschamber.com Weekly: Start Spreading the Word

From: membership@uschamber.com [mailto:membership@uschamber.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 10:44 AM
To: Governor Sarah Palin (GOV sponsored)
Subject: uschamber.com Weekly: Start Spreading the Word

uschamber.com Weekly is being sent to governor@gov.state.ak.us as a member benefit on behalf of the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce.

If you have trouble reading this e-mail or clicking the links, you can read *uschamber.com Weekly* online.

uschamber.com

THE SMALL BUSINESS PUBLICATION OF THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

Your member number is: 5301555

Log in to the Web site.

CHOOSE FEDEX AND SAVE

U.S. Chamber members enjoy discounts up to 20% on select FedEx Express® services, up to 12% on select FedEx Ground® services and 15% on select FedEx Kinko's℠ services. Members call 800-345-6227 and mention code 150-14, or visit our online member benefits center for more information and to sign up.

IN THE NEWS

"The study [on purchases of counterfeit goods] confirmed what we already knew: That the buying of these products is widespread and is viewed as a victimless crime."

--Caroline Joiner, executive director of the Chamber's global anti-counterfeiting and

In This Week's Newsletter: August 28, 2007

COMMENTARY

Start Spreading the Word
By Tom Donohue

Last week the U.S. Chamber held six events in four days in Los Angeles to highlight t devastating impact counterfeiting and piracy are having on business brand names an sales, public health and safety, and the economy. Activities included press conferenc with Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and numerous members of Congress, a event with fashion designers, and a police raid on counterfeiting operations in L.A.'s infamous Santee Alley that involved U.S. Chamber investigators.

Read the rest of this article.

WASHINGTON UPDATE

Chamber Concludes L.A. Anti-Counterfeiting Week
The U.S. Chamber wrapped up a highly successful week of educational and media e' on the topic of counterfeiting and piracy in Los Angeles last week, culminating in a pc raid that resulted in the seizure of more than $10 million in fake products and five arre Over the four days, the Chamber held six events featuring state and local officials, members of Congress, and business leaders.

piracy initiative.
The Los Angeles Times.
August 20

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND RALLY ON THE HILL

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce will host a rally on Capitol Hill on September 26, 2007 from 1PM - 4PM. Attendees will visit members of Congress to lobby for strengthening and reauthorizing No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Sign up today.

Get the facts on counterfeiting and piracy at TheTrueCosts.org.

Chamber Launches Auto Jobs Coalition
The U.S. Chamber has joined other U.S. business groups to form the Automotive Jobs Action Coalition (AJAC). This national grassroots coalition will raise awareness among policy makers about the real costs associated with extreme increases in the fuel economy standards, including putting 2.3 million automotive jobs at risk, limiting consumer choice, and undermining automotive safety.

Read the press release.

Chamber, SBA Partner on Disaster Preparedness, Recovery
The U.S. Chamber's Business Civic Leadership Center (BCLC) and the Small Business Administration (SBA) announced a historic agreement to work together on disaster preparedness and recovery. Local chambers of commerce will join BCLC and the SBA and its partners in sharing a variety of information and resources.

Read the press release.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Mixed Bag on Housing Figures
August 28, 2007--Housing starts fell 6.1% to 1.38 million units in July and are down 20.9% year-over-year. Concurrently, new home sales increased 2.8% to 870,000 units. Industrial production increased 0.3% in July while the Index of Leading Indicators rose 0.4%. Last, new orders for durable goods jumped a much larger-than-expected 5.9%.

Get further analysis.

REGIONAL NEWS

This Week's Regional News: http://www.uschamber.com/publications/weekly/regional/

Northeast
N.H.: High Tech Industry Lagging, Experts Say
R.I.: Small Businesses Get Health Insurance Plan

Southeast
La.: Officials Say State Was Shorted on Fisheries Funds
S.C.: Governor's Panel to Vote on Energy Suggestions

Central Plains
Ind.: Job Losses Propel Foreclosures
Ohio: Renewable Energy Bill to be Announced

West
Ariz.: State Joins Regional Greenhouse Gas Plan
Calif.: Governor Warns of Health Care Veto

TIPS & TOOLS

Giving Healthy Benefits
As a business owner in a competitive market, you want to make sure you--and your employees--are getting the right amount of health care coverage at the best rate.
Our Employer Toolkit can help you decide what benefits to provide your employees and how to find a provider that will meet your needs.

Get started on your benefits plan.

IN THE MAGAZINE

Finding Office Space to Fit Your Needs
After personnel costs, rent accounts for the most significant portion of a business' expenditures. For business owners not schooled in the intricacies of leasing, here are some points to consider.

Read the rest of this article.

TWO IMPORTANT NOTES

First, don't forget to add us to your address book or "approved senders list" to ensure our messages do not get blocked -- this way you will receive each issue in a timely and consistent manner.

Second, be aware that we do not send any attachments from this e-mail address. Never open any suspicious attachments even if the message appears to come from *uschamber.com Weekly*.

USCHAMBER.COM WEEKLY

uschamber.com Weekly
Editor: John Reid
Writers: Sheryll Poe, Giovanni Coratolo

Subscriber Tools

You are subscribed as: governor@gov.state.ak.us

Subscribe | Forward this message | Contact us
Manage subscriptions | Receive as plain text | Auto-unsubscribe

U.S. Chamber of Commerce | 1615 H Street, NW | Washington, DC 20062
www.uschamber.com/sb

Unknown

From: Tibbles, Michael A (GOV) [/O=SOA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MATIBBLES]

Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2007 8:44 AM

To: gov.sarah@yahoo.com

Subject: RE: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

OK.

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com [mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wed 8/29/2007 8:41 AM
To: Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)
Subject: Re: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

Not yet. Let me get thru this MatMaid presser before we set up addl discussions outside admin.
Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----
From: "Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)" <mike.tibbles@alaska.gov>

Date: Wed, 29 Aug 2007 08:34:19
To:gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

Do you feel confident enough that we can get things finalized today that I can have support staff start setting up meetings for tomorrow and friday (making calls today to set up meetings for tomorrow and friday)? Beyond the overall approach, the tax rate issue is still outstanding.

Mike

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com [mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wed 8/29/2007 8:23 AM
To: Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)
Cc: Perry, Kristina Y (GOV); Mason, Janice L (GOV)
Subject: Re: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

Yes, wee must spend time this aft.

And tomorrow I will be heading back to Valley at 2:30, immediatley aft last interview, I will be unavailable from 3:30 to 4:30.
Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----
From: "Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)" <mike.tibbles@alaska.gov>

Date: Wed, 29 Aug 2007 08:18:27
To:gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

OK, I just got logged back in. My cell died overnight.

I will follow up to make sure the judges are moved and notified they will be participating in a phone interview. I will plan on staying in Anchorage well.

Privileged or Personal Material Redacted

Since Monday is a holiday, thursday and friday are our best days to brief legislators on the direction we are going. I am hopeful that we can work out final detail with you today and start our disucssions with legislators tomorrow. We still need to put together the talking points, charts, etc. The data should speak for itself, so the charts and talking points should not be too difficult. We should focus on the appropriate revenues to the state as well as maintaining a positive environment for new companies to come explore, invest and develop our resources.

This afternoon, can we spend time finalizing where we are at?

Mike

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com [mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com <mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Wed 8/29/2007 6:49 AM
To: Tibbles, Michael A (GOV); Mason, Janice L (GOV); Perry, Kristina Y (GOV)
Subject: Janice: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

J- i can't be absent from ppt debate tonight and tomorrow - I'll have to conduct judges interviews via telephone. Mike can help with the re-arranging of Rep Thomas' mtg- I'm wondering if he can fly up here tonight or tomorrow if his mtg can't wait until my travels down there next wk.

Pls don't schedule anything after the judges interviews tomorrow - I'll need to keep it clear for internal gross/ppt "convincing debate/discussions" with the team and then legislators.

Mike- I may ask revenue/oil folks to come for casual dinner at my house thursday night for fuller explanations of where they think we should go on ppt/gross. I'll ask Kris to help me with that. This is the most imp roll-out we'll engage in... if we're not all on the same page, then we're doing Alaskans a major disservice.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----
From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com

Date: Wed, 29 Aug 2007 14:35:32
To:"Michael A Tibbles" <mike.tibbles@alaska.gov>
Subject: Ppt meeting Re: Friday

I can do Juneau tues evening-thurs next wk instead of tonight. Ppt is way too impt to be absent from the discussions. Thomas and Wilson should be told of the ppt importance this week, can they either fly up here if their mtg tomorrow can't wait, or be patient with my schedule until i can get there tues-thurs next week.
Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com

Date: Wed, 29 Aug 2007 13:17:34
To:"Michael A Tibbles" <mike.tibbles@alaska.gov>
Subject: Re: Friday

Doesnt it make sense for me to also conduct the interviees via phone, as I've done every other judge interview? And I'm still not comfortable with the ppt/gross presentation from yest. We still haven't spoken to Mark.

this week's schedule again got pretty full with mtgs that could wait, in light of the gravity of the ppt discussions that are so important to tackle before tues. Remember im booked over the weekend so yest, today and tomorrow are very imp days for my participation in ppt debate. We have to strategize better on the scheduling when we know something huge is around the corner so our days are more flexible leading up to a big roll-out again.
------Original Message------
From: Michael A Tibbles
To: Governor Sarah Palin
Sent: Aug 28, 2007 10:05 PM
Subject: RE: Friday

We were working on a plan tonight to get to legislators about PPT by dividing our folks into teams. If we do walk through the economics we can show that we have studied many options and have the best balance of revenue and positive investment climate. We all concluded that thursday and friday are critical to reach legislators and that it would be very helpful if I could take several of the meetings (namely Lyda and Charlie). What would you think if I stayed in anchorage thurs and did not go to Juneau and participate in the judicial interviews?
We have done a pretty good tag team approach so far and I do not to leave you short staffed.

-----Original Message-----
From: "gov.sarah@yahoo.com" <gov.sarah@yahoo.com>
To: "Mason, Janice L (GOV)" <janice.mason@alaska.gov>; "Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)" <mike.tibbles@alaska.gov>; "Perry, Kristina Y (GOV)" <kris.perry@alaska.gov>
Sent: 8/28/2007 8:40 PM
Subject: Friday

Can we swtich friday's DOC mtg to after the 10:00 am speech?
Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Unknown

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 7:18 AM
To: Katz; John W (GOV)
Cc: Nizich; Michael A (GOV); Persily; Larry A (GOV); Sam Bishop; Crome; Cora J (GOV); Perry; Kristina Y (GOV); Stapleton; Meghan N (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV); Leighow; Sharon W (GOV); Talis Colberg
Subject: Re: US Arctic Claims

Got it. I appreciate this info, as I have to be honest with you in my need for an education on this topic. I've been absent from this international debate - so feel free to pile on any addl info you deem appropriate for me to absorb on this.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----

From: "John Katz" <jwkatz@ALASKADC.org>

Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2007 11:13:35

To:<gov.sarah@yahoo.com>

Cc:"Michael A Nizich" <mike.nizich@alaska.gov>,"Larry Persily" <lpersily@ALASKADC.org>,"Sam Bishop" <sbishop.gwpo.gwdom@ALASKADC.org>,"Cora Crome" <cora_crome@gov.state.ak.us>,"Kris Perry" <kris_perry@gov.state.ak.us>,"Meghan Stapleton" <meghan_stapleton@gov.state.ak.us>,"Michael Tibbles" <michael_tibbles@gov.state.ak.us>,"Sharon Leighow" <sharon_leighow@gov.state.ak.us>,"Talis Colberg" <Talis.Colberg@law.state.ak.us>

Subject: Re: US Arctic Claims

There have been no Senate votes in recent history. So, it's hard to tell exactly who supports the Convention and who does not.

Previously, Senators Lott (MS) and Inhofe (OK) have confirmed their opposition. On the other hand, Senators Biden and Lugar, Chairman and Ranking Member, respectively, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, support the Convention, but it is not yet clear whether they will bring it up this year.

According to Senator Murkowski's staff, the Senator is getting Alaska constituent mail on both sides of ratification. A majority supports approval.

I think we can expect some opposition in Alaska if you support the Convention. There are some Alaskans who believe that the US has failed to assert its sovereign rights to Wrangel Island and certain other islands owned by Russia. These individuals can be expected to oppose ratification of the Convention for fear of losing US sovereignty.

I know from precious experience that these folks can be quite vigorous in their opposition. However, most experts believe that, in the absence of US approval of the Convention, we would have to assert our rights unilaterally. For these reasons, they favor the Convention, because it creates a forum for adjudicating claims in a quasi judicial manner.

Please note that my email address has changed. My new email address is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. Thank you .

Please note that my email address has changed. My new email address is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. Thank you .

>>> On 8/28/2007 at 10:18 AM, in message <1751581980-1188310662-cardhu_decombobulator_blackberry.rim.net-540377570-@bxe039.bisx.prod.on.blackberry>, <gov.sarah@yahoo.com> wrote:

This sounds good - unless I'm missing something, these sentiments reflect my position. Who are the senators in opposition?

After we finalize, Sharon can send this letter to the international reporter who asked about this issue on Sunday.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----

From: "John Katz" <jwkatz@ALASKADC.org>

Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2007 10:11:44

To:"Governor Sarah Palin" <gov.sarah@yahoo.com>

Cc:"Larry Persily" <lpersily@ALASKADC.org>,"Sam Bishop" <sbishop@ALASKADC.org>,"Cora Crome" <cora_crome@gov.state.ak.us>,"Kris Perry" <kris_perry@gov.state.ak.us>,"Meghan Stapleton" <meghan_stapleton@gov.state.ak.us>,"Michael Tibbles" <michael_tibbles@gov.state.ak.us>,"Sharon Leighow" <sharon_leighow@gov.state.ak.us>

Subject: US Arctic Claims

This is through Mike Tibbles

Per your request, I have drafted the letter below to Senators Stevens = and Murkowski for

your consideration.

Dear Senator -------

It is my understanding that the US Senate may consider the United = Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the fall.

With this in mind, I am writing to express my strong support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. In my opinion, the Convention = would be beneficial to the US and Alaska in various ways, but I want to = focus on one aspect in this correspondence.

As you know, several Arctic nations have recently asserted claims to = submerged lands off their coasts. The Convention on the Law of the = Sea establishes the framework for these assertions. To date, 155 = nations, including Canada and Russia, have approved the Convention. = If the US does not ratify the Convention, the opportunity to pursue our = own claims to offshore areas in the Arctic Ocean might well be = lost.

As a consequence, our rightful claims to hydrocarbons, = minerals, and other natural resources could be ignored. In this = regard, geologists have prognosticated that billions of barrels of crude = oil and vast quantities of natural gas - not to mention various hard = rock minerals - might be present in the Arctic. In the absence of = affirmative action by the Senate, these resources could become the = property of nations with less valid claims.

It is my understanding that the Bush administration and many = Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, have expressed support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. However, as you know, = ratification has been thwarted by a small group of Senators who are = concerned about the perceived loss of US sovereignty.

I believe th at quite the contrary is the case. If the US does = not ratify the Convention, we will be denied access to the forum establishe= d by the international community to adjudicate claims to submerged lands = in the Arctic.

I also urge that the Congress authorize the programs and funds = necessary for the US to assert its sovereign rights. The assertion = of such rights requires significant research and information gathering.&nbs= p; Other Arctic nations have recently begun this process, and I understand = that the US is moving in this direction as well.

I believe that you have previously supported Senate ratification of = the Convention. With this letter, I want to put my Administration on = record in support of the Convention as the predicate for asserting = sovereign rights that will be of benefit to Alaska and the nation. = Hopefully, this letter will assist you in articulating Alaska's = position to your c olleagues in the Senate.

Thank you for considering my views.

Please note t hat my email address has = changed. My new email address = is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. = Thank you .

Unknown

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 6:18 AM
To: Katz; John W (GOV)
Cc: Persily; Larry A (GOV); Bishop; Samuel T (GOV); Crome; Cora J (GOV); Perry; Kristina Y (GOV); Stapleton; Meghan N (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV); Leighow; Sharon W (GOV); Nizich; Michael A (GOV)
Subject: Re: US Arctic Claims

This sounds good - unless I'm missing something, these sentiments reflect my position. Who are the senators in opposition?

After we finalize, Sharon can send this letter to the international reporter who asked about this issue on Sunday.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----

From: "John Katz" <jwkatz@ALASKADC.org>

Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2007 10:11:44

To:"Governor Sarah Palin" <gov.sarah@yahoo.com>

Cc:"Larry Persily" <lpersily@ALASKADC.org>,"Sam Bishop" <sbishop@ALASKADC.org>,"Cora Crome" <cora_crome@gov.state.ak.us>,"Kris Perry" <kris_perry@gov.state.ak.us>,"Meghan Stapleton" <meghan_stapleton@gov.state.ak.us>,"Michael Tibbles" <michael_tibbles@gov.state.ak.us>,"Sharon Leighow" <sharon_leighow@gov.state.ak.us>

Subject: US Arctic Claims

This is through Mike Tibbles

Per your request, I have drafted the letter below to Senators Stevens = and Murkowski for your consideration.

Dear Senator -------

It is my understanding that the US Senate may consider the United = Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the fall.

With this in mind, I am writing to express my strong support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. In my opinion, the Convention = would be beneficial to the US and Alaska in various ways, but I want to = focus on one aspect in this correspondence.

As you know, several Arctic nations have recently asserted claims to = submerged lands off their coasts. The Convention on the Law of the = Sea establishes the framework for these assertions. To date, 155 = nations, including Canada and Russia, have approved the Convention. = If the US does not ratify the Convention, the opportunity to pursue our = own claims to offshore areas in the Arctic Ocean might well be = lost.

As a consequence, our rightful claims to hydrocarbons, = minerals, and other natural resources could be ignored. In this = regard, geologists have prognosticated that billions of barrels of crude = oil and vast quantities of natural gas - not to mention various hard = rock minerals - might be present in the Arctic. In the absence of = affirmative action by the Senate, these resources could become the = property of nations with less valid claims.

It is my understanding that the Bush administration and many = Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, have expressed support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. However, as you know, = ratification has been thwarted by a small group of Senators who are = concerned about the perceived loss of US sovereignty.

I believe that quite the contrary is the case. If the US does = not ratify the Convention, we will be denied access to the forum establishe= d by the international community to adjudicate claims to submerged lands = in the Arctic.

I also urge that the Congress authorize the programs and funds = necessary for the US to assert its sovereign rights. The assertion = of such rights requires significant research and information gathering.&nbs= p; Other Arctic nations have recently begun this process, and I understand = that the US is moving in this direction as well.

I believe that you have previously supported Senate ratification of = the Convention. With this letter, I want to put my Administration on = record in support of the Convention as the predicate for asserting = sovereign rights that will be of benefit to Alaska and the nation. = Hopefully, this letter will assist you in articulating Alaska's = position to your colleagues in the Senate.

Thank you for considering my views.

Please note that my email address has = changed. My new email address = is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. = Thank you .

Unknown

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:08 AM
To: Mason; Janice L (GOV); Perry; Kristina Y (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV)
Cc: Leighow; Sharon W (GOV)
Subject: Begich

I did not know the begich mtg was scheduled for tomorrow am. Now that it is set, i need to change flt to Juneau from tomorrow nite to next morning bc some kid appts will have to be changed on my part.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Unknown

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:41 PM
To: Mason; Janice L (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV); Perry; Kristina Y (GOV)
Subject: Friday

Can we swtich friday's DOC mtg to after the 10:00 am speech?

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Unknown

From: Lisa Parker [LParker@agrium.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 2:22 PM
To: Palin; Sarah H (GOV)
Cc: Balash; Joseph R (GOV)
Subject: Agrium Kenai Nitrogen Operations

Governor Palin

Attached is a letter discussing issues associated with Agrium's Kenai Nitrogen Operations that we thought you should be aware of. We want you and your administration to be aware of the critical nature of our facility at this juncture.

Our future does not appear bright. At what point would you like us to inform you that we will be closing the facility and laying off 150 Alaskan workers?

We are available to meet should you so desire to.

Sincerely yours,

Lisa Parker

Lisa Parker

Manager, U.S. Government Relations

Agrium Corporate Relations

907-776-3275 (office)

907-398-1883 (mobile)

907-776-5766 (fax)

lparker@agrium.com

Unknown

From: /o=SOA/ou=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=srparnell1
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 9:05 AM
To: gov.sarah@yahoo.com
Subject: Tire tax info

Here's the tire tax info from the Revenue Sources book.

Tire Fee

The tire fee has two components. Th e first component is a tax of $2.50 on all new tires sold in Alaska for motor vehicles intended for highway use. The second component is an additional $5 fee per tire on all new tires with heavy studs sold in Alaska, and a $5 fee per tire on the installation of heavy studs on a previously un-studded tire. Our forecast of tire fee revenue is based on the expected number of vehicle registrations in the state.

Unknown

From: Mason, Janice L (GOV) [/O=SOA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JLMASON]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:13 AM
To: gov.sarah@yahoo.com; Perry; Kristina Y (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV)
Cc: Leighow; Sharon W (GOV)
Subject: RE: Begich

Governor, I would like to change the Begich meeting to later in the afternoon (tomorrow) - 1:30 or 2:00 p.m. as doing a Thursday morning flight into Juneau bumps Rep. Wilson and Rep. Thomas on the schedule for that day. Janice

-----Original Message-----

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com [mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:08 AM

To: Mason, Janice L (GOV); Perry, Kristina Y (GOV); Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)

Cc: Leighow, Sharon W (GOV)

Subject: Begich

I did not know the begich mtg was scheduled for tomorrow am. Now that it is set, i need to change flt to Juneau from tomorrow nite to next morning bc some kid appts will have to be changed on my part.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Unknown

From: Mason, Janice L (GOV) [/O=SOA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JLMASON]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:13 AM
To: gov.sarah@yahoo.com; Perry; Kristina Y (GOV); Tibbles; Michael A (GOV)
Cc: Leighow; Sharon W (GOV)
Subject: RE: Begich

Governor, I would like to change the Begich meeting to later in the afternoon (tomorrow) - 1:30 or 2:00 p.m. as doing a Thursday morning flight into Juneau bumps Rep. Wilson and Rep. Thomas on the schedule for that day. Janice

-----Original Message-----

From: gov.sarah@yahoo.com [mailto:gov.sarah@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:08 AM

To: Mason, Janice L (GOV); Perry, Kristina Y (GOV); Tibbles, Michael A (GOV)

Cc: Leighow, Sharon W (GOV)

Subject: Begich

I did not know the begich mtg was scheduled for tomorrow am. Now that it is set, i need to change flt to Juneau from tomorrow nite to next morning bc some kid appts will have to be changed on my part.

Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

Unknown

From: Fagerstrom, Erika (GOV) [/O=SOA/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=EFAGERSTROM]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:35 AM
To: Palin; Sarah (GOV sponsored)
Subject: RE: Interview

Hello Governor,

Thank you for the kind/encouraging words! Always interesting what and how they put things together for the final product.

See you Thursday!

:)

Erika

Erika Fagerstrom

Executive Residence Manager

Governor's House

State of Alaska, Office of the Governor

716 Calhoun Avenue, Juneau, Alaska 99801

Phone: 907-465-3500; Fax: 907-465-2031

-----Original Message-----

From: Palin, Sarah (GOV sponsored)

Sent: Monday, August 27, 2007 7:36 PM

To: Fagerstrom, Erika (GOV)

Cc: 'fek9wnr@yahoo.com'; Tibbles, Michael A (GOV); Nizich, Michael A (GOV); Stapleton, Meghan N (GOV); Leighow, Sharon W (GOV)

Subject: Interview

Hi Erika!

I just listened to your APRN interview... that was awesome... great job, and thanks so much for tackling the mansion repairs issue with the media. Thank you!

Byers, Gail Y (LAW)

From: John Katz [jwkatz@ALASKADC.org]

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 9:45 AM

To: gov.sarah@yahoo.com

Cc: Michael A Nizich; Larry Persily; Sam Bishop; Cora Crome; Kris Perry; Meghan Stapleton; Michael Tibbles; Sharon Leighow; Talis Colberg

Subject: Re: US Arctic Claims

In response to your interest in having additional information, I have reviewed several documents and have attached just two. The first is a good summary which appeared as an article in the Wall Street Journal on August 22nd.

The second is a brief excerpt from a Congressional Research Report updating an earlier CRS study. As you will note, the excerpt deals with the National Security considerations associated with the Convention. Since National Security is the principal reason cited by most opponents, I thought that this brief point-counterpoint would be useful.

I am not an expert in international law, but the arguments made by the Legal Advisor to the State Department and by the US Navy were convincing to me. Despite this, I know that the opponents, including various bloggers, will not give up on their opposition to the Convention.

Please note that my email address has changed. My new email address is jwkatz@alaskadc.org. Thank you .

>>> On 8/28/2007 at 11:18 AM, in message <867444738-1188314279-cardhu_decombobulator_blackberry.rim.net-606684654-@bxe039.bisx.prod.on.blackberry>, <gov.sarah@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Got it. I appreciate this info, as I have to be honest with you in my need for an education on this topic. I've been absent from this international debate - so feel free to pile on any addl info you deem appropriate for me to absorb on this.
> Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: "John Katz" <jwkatz@ALASKADC.org>
>
> Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2007 11:13:35
> To:<gov.sarah@yahoo.com>
> Cc:"Michael A Nizich" <mike.nizich@alaska.gov>,"Larry Persily" <lpersily@ALASKADC.org>,"Sam Bishop" <sbishop.gwpo.gwdom@ALASKADC.org>,"Cora Crome" <cora_crome@gov.state.ak.us>,"Kris Perry" <kris_perry@gov.state.ak.us>,"Meghan Stapleton" <meghan_stapleton@gov.state.ak.us>,"Michael Tibbles"

<michael_tibbles@gov.state.ak.us>,"Sharon Leighow"
<sharon_leighow@gov.state.ak.us>,"Talis Colberg"
<Talis.Colberg@law.state.ak.us>
Subject: Re: US Arctic Claims

There have been no Senate votes in recent history. So, it's hard to tell exactly who supports the Convention and who does not.

Previously, Senators Lott (MS) and Inhofe (OK) have confirmed their opposition. On the other hand, Senators Biden and Lugar, Chairman and Ranking Member, respectively, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, support the Convention, but it is not yet clear whether they will bring it up this year.

According to Senator Murkowski's staff, the Senator is getting Alaska constituent mail on both sides of ratification. A majority supports approval.

I think we can expect some opposition in Alaska if you support the Convention. There are some Alaskans who believe that the US has failed to assert its sovereign rights to Wrangel Island and certain other islands owned by Russia. These individuals can be expected to oppose ratification of the Convention for fear of losing US sovereignty.

I know from precious experience that these folks can be quite vigorous in their opposition. However, most experts believe that, in the absence of US approval of the Convention, we would have to assert our rights unilaterally. For these reasons, they favor the Convention, because it creates a forum for adjudicating claims in a quasi judicial manner.

Please note that my email address has changed. My new email address is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. Thank you .

Please note that my email address has changed. My new email address is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. Thank you .

>>> On 8/28/2007 at 10:18 AM, in message <1751581980-1188310662-cardhu_decombobulator_blackberry.rim.net-540377570-@bxe039.bisx.prod.on.blackberry>, <gov.sarah@yahoo.com> wrote:

This sounds good - unless I'm missing something, these sentiments reflect my position. Who are the senators in opposition?

After we finalize, Sharon can send this letter to the international reporter who asked about this issue on Sunday.
Sent from my BlackBerry® device from Cellular One

-----Original Message-----

From: "John Katz" <jwkatz@ALASKADC.org>

Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2007 10:11:44
To:"Governor Sarah Palin" <gov.sarah@yahoo.com>
Cc:"Larry Persily" <lpersily@ALASKADC.org>,"Sam Bishop" <sbishop@ALASKADC.org>,"Cora Crome" <cora_crome@gov.state.ak.us>,"Kris Perry" <kris_perry@gov.state.ak.us>,"Meghan Stapleton" <meghan_stapleton@gov.state.ak.us>,"Michael Tibbles" <michael_tibbles@gov.state.ak.us>,"Sharon Leighow" <sharon_leighow@gov.state.ak.us>
Subject: US Arctic Claims

This is through Mike Tibbles

Per your request, I have drafted the letter below to Senators Stevens = and Murkowski for your consideration.

Dear Senator -------

It is my understanding that the US Senate may consider the United = Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the fall.

With this in mind, I am writing to express my strong support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. In my opinion, the Convention = would be beneficial to the US and Alaska in various ways, but I want to = focus on one aspect in this correspondence.

As you know, several Arctic nations have recently asserted claims to = submerged lands off their coasts. The Convention on the Law of the = Sea establishes the framework for these assertions. To date, 155 = nations, including Canada and Russia, have approved the Convention. = If the US does not ratify the Convention, the opportunity to pursue our = own claims to offshore areas in the Arctic Ocean might well be = lost.

As a consequence, our rightful claims to hydrocarbons, = minerals, and other natural resources could be ignored. In this = regard, geologists have prognosticated that billions of barrels of crude = oil and vast quantities of natural gas - not to mention various hard = rock minerals - might be present in the Arctic. In the absence of = affirmative action by the Senate, these resources could become the = property of nations with less valid claims.

It is my understanding that the Bush administration and many = Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, have expressed support for = Senate ratification of the Convention. However, as you know, = ratification has been thwarted by a small group of Senators who are = concerned about the perceived loss of US sovereignty.

I believe th at quite the contrary is the case. If the US does = not ratify the

Convention, we will be denied access to the forum establishe= d by the international community to adjudicate claims to submerged lands = in the Arctic.

I also urge that the Congress authorize the programs and funds = necessary for the US to assert its sovereign rights. The assertion = of such rights requires significant research and information gathering.&nbs= p; Other Arctic nations have recently begun this process, and I understand = that the US is moving in this direction as well.

I believe that you have previously supported Senate ratification of = the Convention. With this letter, I want to put my Administration on = record in support of the Convention as the predicate for asserting = sovereign rights that will be of benefit to Alaska and the nation. = Hopefully, this letter will assist you in articulating Alaska's = position to your c olleagues in the Senate.

Thank you for considering my views.

Please note t hat my email address has = changed. My new email address = is <mailto:jwkatz@alaskadc.org> jwkatz@alaskadc.org. = Thank you .

Wall Street Journal

U.S. Resistance to Sea Treaty Thaws

As Arctic Opens Up, Unlikely Alliance Helps to Persuade Senate Skeptics

By NEIL KING JR.
August 22, 2007; Page A6

WASHINGTON -- What do the Nature Conservancy, **Exxon Mobil** Corp., offshore oil drillers, the fishing, shipping and diamond industries, President Bush and the U.S. Navy have in common?

RULING THE SEAS

The effort to lay down comprehensive rules for navigation and use of the sea goes back centuries.

1702 -- Dutch jurist Cornelius Bynkershoek, in his book "De Dominio Maris," asserts that states should have a territorial right to the waters within three nautical miles of their shores, or roughly the distance of a cannon shot, which becomes the custom in most parts of the world.

1918 -- President Wilson makes "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas" one of the Fourteen Points in his blueprint for peace after World War I.

1930 -- A League of Nations conference in the Hague tries for the first time to hammer out a legal treaty on use of the sea, but the gathering ends in failure.

1945 -- President Truman unilaterally claims the right to search for oil or other minerals on any part of the U.S. continental shelf, forcing many other countries -- including Argentina, Chile, Peru, Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya -- to take similar steps. Some assert rights to a 12-mile territorial sea, departing from the customary three-mile rule.

1956 -- The United Nations holds its first Conference on the Law of the Sea, which lays down important rules on fishing rights, sea lanes and the continental shelf.

Answer: They all support a little-known but highly contentious international treaty -- set to come before the U.S. Senate next month for ratification -- that governs nearly every aspect of ocean law, from underwater mineral rights to access to shipping lanes.

The 208-page Law of the Sea Convention, debated since the 1930s and sealed in 1982, has stirred passions for decades in Washington. Critics in the Senate have repeatedly blocked its ratification, saying the pact would undercut U.S. sovereignty. Supporters tout the treaty as a pillar of international law and key to long-term U.S. security. The U.S. is now one of fewer than 40 countries, and the only significant power, not to have joined.

That is now almost certain to change, for three reasons: scarce energy sources, the thawing Arctic ice cap and the U.S. Navy's desire for unfettered access to the world's seaways. These motivations have helped galvanize an odd coalition of environmentalists, oil interests and military brass to persuade enough senators to back the treaty.

The renewed interest has grown more intense amid a scramble to claim undersea territories in the resource-rich Arctic.

Looking to buttress its legal case for ownership of a massive undersea ridge, Russia planted its flag earlier this month on a seabed more than 15,000 feet below the North Pole. Canada, asserting its disputed rights, plans a new fleet of ice-breaking ships and a deepwater Arctic port; yesterday, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper asserted his country's claim to the so-called Northwest Passage along its northern coast during a meeting with Mr. Bush in Quebec. And Denmark is sending a research team to push its own claim to undersea holdings that extend far from Greenland.

All this has put the U.S. in a jam. The Law of the Sea

1960 -- A second U.N. conference makes no progress toward a more comprehensive treaty.

1967 -- Amid rising concern over offshore oil drilling and conflicting claims among nations, Malta's ambassador to the United Nations, Arvid Pardo, gives a speech at the U.N. calling for "an effective international regime over the seabed and the ocean floor." The speech helps spur momentum for a third attempt at an international agreement.

1973 -- The U.N. convenes a third law-of-the-sea conference in New York. The effort drags on until 1982, when agreement is reached on a sweeping accord laying down rules on nearly every aspect of international navigation and economic rights within the world's oceans.

1982 -- President Reagan objects to the treaty's deep-sea mining provisions and refuses to put it forward for Senate ratification.

1994 -- President Clinton signs the Law of the Sea Convention, which goes into force the same year, after its mining provisions are amended. But the Republican-controlled Senate declines to ratify it.

2004 -- Under pressure from conservatives in his party, Majority Leader Bill Frist refuses to bring the measure up for a vote despite its unanimous passage by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

May 2007 -- President Bush releases a statement urging the Senate to ratify the treaty. The heads of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines, along with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, send a letter to the Senate backing the treaty.

Treaty allows countries -- even nonsignatories -- exclusive rights to the seabed extending 200 nautical miles from their shores. Countries can then present evidence to claim rights to any of their continental shelf beyond that. Claims and disputes fall to one of several arbitration bodies established by the treaty. Without being a party to the treaty, the U.S. has no clear way -- short of threatening force -- to assert its claims.

U.S. officials said the stakes are literally vast. In the Arctic alone, the U.S. could lay claim to more than 200,000 square miles of additional undersea territories. The U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Healy is in the region to continue mapping the ocean floor to help strengthen the U.S. case. By some estimates, the country's total additional undersea holdings, including extensions off the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico, could exceed 300,000 square miles, or roughly twice the size of California.

Recent estimates have found the Arctic could contain the equivalent of more than 400 billion barrels of oil and gas and massive amounts of another potential energy source, crystallized methane. The U.S. Geological Survey has estimated the amount of carbon found in hydrate form world-wide is "conservatively" twice the amount found in all the world's fossil fuels.

Increased thawing of the Arctic ice cap is also beginning to open up seaways, such as the long-heralded Northwest Passage that is expected to revolutionize shipping. Still blocked by ice much of the year, the polar pathway linking China to Northern Europe and the Northwest U.S. is about 5,000 miles shorter than routes through the Suez or Panama canals. Canada for years has asserted its sovereignty over the passage, a claim the U.S. and other countries dispute.

Environmentalists back the Law of the Sea Treaty because of its provisions for controlling pollution, from ships and underwater exploration.

Policy makers in Washington have generally been slow to champion the treaty. President Reagan opposed the original pact's undersea-mining rules as biased against U.S. interests, a position that still carries much weight with many conservatives. President Clinton signed the treaty after those rules were amended, but the Republican-controlled Senate refused to go along. In 2004, the measure withered again on Capitol Hill.

Sea Change

If the U.S. becomes a party to the Law of the Sea treaty, it could extend its seabed rights by an area nearly twice the size of California.

Source: University of New Hampshire Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping

Under pressure from oil groups and diplomats in his administration, Mr. Bush in May endorsed the pact's ratification for the first time. The heads of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines followed suit with an unusual joint letter urging Senate passage.

The pact still has some vocal critics in Washington. Former Reagan adviser Frank Gaffney calls it "a socialist manifesto for the redistribution of wealth." Now the head of the Center for Security Policy, a conservative think tank in Washington, Mr. Gaffney says "no senator who has actually read this treaty would vote for it."

Republican Sen. James Inhofe of Oklahoma, one of at least a dozen conservatives who oppose the treaty, calls it "a disaster" and vows to work to block it from a full Senate vote. Other critics say the treaty will weaken U.S. efforts to interdict illicit shipments of nuclear materials and entangle the armed forces in a web of international regulations. As for the Arctic's resource potential, they say the U.S. could work out an accommodation with the half-dozen other nations with a stake there.

The Navy, the pact's most ardent supporter, dismisses such claims. "This for us is global mobility. That's what it's all about," says Rear Adm. Bruce MacDonald, the Navy's judge advocate general.

The treaty is now the world's primary legal blueprint for what constitutes international waters and airspace. It grants all navies the right to "innocent passage" through the world's seaways. Yet dozens of countries, from Ecuador and Somalia to China, South Korea and Vietnam, continue to try to limit the rights of warships to pass through their waters.

Joining the pact, Adm. MacDonald said, would give the U.S. a forum to contest such claims. "We need this treaty to lock in the rights we already have."

Administration officials also argue that Washington's failure to sign on to the treaty has, in fact, undercut the Proliferation Security Initiative, a U.S. effort to enlist international help to cut off shipments of nuclear and missile technology to countries such as Iran or North Korea.

Two countries that have declined to join PSI, Malaysia and Indonesia, recently cited Washington's spurning of the Law of the Sea Treaty as their main reason.

Others argue that the U.S. is already losing out in what promises to be a multibillion-dollar opportunity: the undersea mining of copper, zinc, cobalt and even diamonds. John Norton Moore, a top legal expert on the law of the sea at the University of Virginia, said Russian and Chinese firms have already laid claim to some of the biggest undersea mines in the world. Without joining the treaty, the U.S. has no forum in which to stake a claim.

"Our sitting on the sidelines all these years has already cost us," he said.

This is an excerpt from "The U.N. Law of the Sea Convention and the United States: developments Since October 2003" by Marjorie Ann Browne

Specialist in International Relations Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, Congressional Research Service

U.S. National Security Interests

Some opponents to U.S. adherence to the treaty package have suggested that such adherence is contrary to U.S. national security interests, especially in a post-September 11 world. They maintained that under the treaty the United States would not be able to carry out counter-terrorism programs such as the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) under which shipments of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), etc., would be interdicted. Referring to Articles 92 and 110 of the Convention, they stated that the treaty does not explicitly guarantee a right to board or interdict when evidence of terrorist intentions through WMD is involved.[10]

Legal Adviser William H. Taft IV during April 8, 2004, hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee addressed the relationship between the Convention and PSI. "The Convention will not affect our efforts under the PSI to interdict vessels suspected of engaging in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction." He added,

> The Convention recognizes numerous legal bases for taking enforcement action against vessels and aircraft suspected of engaging in proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, for example, exclusive port and coastal State jurisdiction in internal waters and national air space; coastal State jurisdiction in the territorial sea and contiguous zone; exclusive flag State jurisdiction over vessels on the high seas (which the flag State may, either by general agreement in advance or approval in response to a specific request, waive in favor of other States); and universal jurisdiction over stateless vessels. Further, nothing in the Convention impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense (a point which is reaffirmed in the proposed Resolution of Advice and Consent).

The United States has concluded PSI ship boarding agreements with seven nations.[11]

Among other statements made by Convention opponents were the following: "The treaty effectively prohibits two functions vital to American security: collecting intelligence in, and submerged transit of, territorial waters." AND "The treaty's Articles 19 and 20 attempt explicitly to regulate intelligence and submarine activities in what are defined as 'territorial' seas. These are activities vital to U.S. security that we should ensure remain unrestricted at all costs."[12]

Taft stated that Articles 19 and 20 do not prohibit intelligence activities or "submerged transit" in the territorial sea of other States. He continued,

> The Convention's provisions on innocent passage are very similar to article 14 in the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, to which the United States is a party. (The 1982 Convention is in fact more favorable than the 1958 Convention....) A ship does not...enjoy the right of innocent passage if, in the case of a submarine, it navigates submerged or if, in the case of any ship, it engages in an act in the territorial sea aimed at collecting information to the prejudice of the defense or security of the coastal State, but such activities are not prohibited by the Convention. In this respect, the Convention makes no change in the situation that has existed for many years and under which we operate today.

In summary, the question of whether the Senate will consider the Convention in 2007 depends on whether the committee considers and possibly recommends it for positive action. The President's statement on May 15, 2007, may be a factor in the Senate's considerations. If the treaty is not considered or withdrawn, it will remain pending in the committee.